



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/055,582	04/06/98	LAU	ACS48047

QM12/0826

JOHN S NAGY
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT
10877 WILSHIRE BLVD
TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90024

EXAMINER

JACKSON, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

10

DATE MAILED: 08/26/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/055,582

Applicant(s)

Lau et al.

Examiner

Suzette Jackson

Group Art Unit

3738



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 6, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 2-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 25-42 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.

☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received:

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5 and 8

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Preliminary Amendment dated April 6, 1998 has been received in application serial number 09/055,582. Claims 2-24 have been officially canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The phrase "and so on up to an N number " in claims 39-41 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The phrase "and so on up to an N number" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. In particular this phrase does not clearly claim the invention and is also vague and indefinite as it is not *exactly* clear to what the applicant is claiming..

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 25, 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schatz USPN 5,902,332 which discloses the invention as claimed comprising: a plurality of cylindrical elements which are expandable with at least one weld connection between each cylindrical element (Please see Figure 7 and col. ^{10, lines 3-48}~~103-48~~); with circumferential offset members (100), however Schatz does not specify welds. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to weld, laser cut, or utilize other methods a metal shaping the connections between cylindrical elements because this is a well know technique utilized in the art of stent making and is a matter of design choice.

Double Patenting

7. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

Art Unit: 3738

8. A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,514,154. This is a double patenting rejection.

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 25-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 5,514,154. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the similarity in nature for example: patent '154 discloses "a serpentine pattern" then application 09/055,582 claims the feature of "sinusoidal". Then application '582 goes on to claim similar and sometimes the same previously claimed material with slight only slight variations.

Art Unit: 3738

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication regarding this application should be directed to examiner Suzette Jackson at (703) 308-6516. If you are unable to reach me, please contact my supervisor, Mickey Yu, at (703) 308-2672. In a case requiring immediate assistance, please call (703) 308-0858 to reach the main operator for Sector 3700.



S. Jackson
23 August 1999



David H. Willse
Primary Examiner